

DTP/98/54

July 1998

# Complete renormalization group improvement of QCD perturbation theory

C.J. Maxwell

*Centre for Particle Theory, University of Durham  
South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, England*

## Abstract

We suggest that at any given order of Feynman diagram calculation for a QCD observable *all* renormalization group (RG)-predictable terms should be resummed to all-orders. This “complete” RG-improvement (CORGI) serves to separate the perturbation series into infinite subsets of terms which when summed are renormalization scheme (RS)-invariant. Crucially all ultraviolet logarithms involving the dimensionful parameter,  $Q$ , on which the observable depends are resummed, thereby building the correct  $Q$ -dependence. There are close connections with the effective charge approach of Grunberg.

The problem of the renormalization scale (scheme) dependence of fixed-order perturbative QCD predictions continues to frustrate attempts to make reliable determinations of the underlying dimensional transmutation parameter of the theory,  $\Lambda_{QCD}$  (usually  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$  or  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  are the fitted quantities). Whilst a number of proposals for controlling or avoiding this difficulty have been advanced [1, 2, 3, 4] no consensus has been reached, with the result that in experimental fits attempts are made to estimate an ad hoc “renormalization scale” uncertainty [5]. This “theoretical error” is typically far larger than the actual experimental errors, and in our view can completely mislead as to both the central value of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$  and the likely importance of uncalculated higher-order corrections [4, 6].

In this letter we wish to propose that one should perform a resummation to all-orders of *all* renormalization group (RG)-predictable terms at each order of perturbation theory. This procedure automatically organizes the series into infinite subsets of terms which are separately renormalization scheme (RS)-invariant, and crucially also, by completely resumming ultraviolet logarithms, generates the correct asymptotic dependence on the single dimensionful parameter ‘ $Q$ ’ on which the observable depends. This “complete” RG-improvement has close connections with other proposed solutions of the RS-dependence problem, in particular with the effective charge approach of Grunberg [2] which focusses on the  $Q$ -dependence of the observable. The principle of resumming *all* known information can also provide a guide for treating situations, such as moments of structure functions and hard hadronic cross-sections, where one encounters factorization scheme (FS) dependence in addition to RS-dependence [7].

We begin by briefly reviewing the problem of parametrizing RS-dependence, and define the concept of RG-predictable terms. Consider the dimensionless QCD observable  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ , dependent on the single energy scale  $Q$  (we assume massless quarks). Without loss of generality, by raising to a power and scaling, we can arrange that  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$  has a perturbation series of the form,

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) = a + r_1 a^2 + r_2 a^3 + \dots + r_n a^{n+1} + \dots, \quad (1)$$

where  $a \equiv \alpha_s(\mu)/\pi$  is the RG-improved coupling. The  $\mu$ -dependence of  $a$  is

governed by the beta-function equation,

$$\frac{\partial a}{\partial \ln \mu} = -ba^2(1 + ca + c_2a^2 + \dots + c_na^n + \dots) . \quad (2)$$

Here  $b$  and  $c$  are the first two universal terms of the QCD beta-function

$$b = \frac{33 - 2N_f}{6} , \quad (3)$$

$$c = \frac{153 - 19N_f}{12b} , \quad (4)$$

with  $N_f$  the number of active quark flavours. As demonstrated by Stevenson [1] the renormalization scheme may be completely labelled by the variables  $\tau \equiv b \ln(\mu/\tilde{\Lambda})$  and the non-universal beta-function coefficients  $c_2, c_3, \dots$ .  $a(\tau, c_2, c_3, \dots)$  is obtained as the solution of the transcendental equation

$$\frac{1}{a} + c \ln \left( \frac{ca}{1 + ca} \right) = \tau - \int_0^a dx \left( -\frac{1}{B(x)} + \frac{1}{x^2(1 + cx)} \right) , \quad (5)$$

where  $B(x) \equiv x^2(1 + cx + c_2x^2 + c_3x^3 + \dots)$ . This is obtained by integrating Eq.(2) with a suitable choice of boundary condition related to the definition of  $\tilde{\Lambda}$ .

For our purposes it will be more useful to label the RS using  $r_1$ , the next-to-leading order (NLO) perturbative coefficient, rather than  $\tau$ . This is possible because [1]

$$\tau - r_1 = \rho_0(Q) \equiv b \ln(Q/\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}) , \quad (6)$$

where  $\rho_0$  is an RS-invariant, hence  $\tau$  can be traded for  $r_1$ .  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}$  is a dimensionful scale dependent on the particular observable. It is related to the *universal* dimensional transmutation parameter  $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}}$  by

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}} \equiv e^{r/b} \tilde{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}} , \quad (7)$$

where  $r \equiv r_1^{\overline{MS}}(\mu = Q)$ . The righthand side of Eq.(7) is independent of the subtraction scheme employed, and as we shall see  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}$  has a physical significance, being directly related to the asymptotic  $Q$ -dependence of  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$

[2, 4, 6]. Equations (5),(6) can then be used to define  $a(r_1, c_2, c_3, \dots)$ .

We next turn to the RS-dependence of the perturbative coefficients  $r_i$ . This must be such as to cancel the RS-dependence of ‘ $a$ ’ when the series is summed to all-orders. The self-consistency of perturbation theory [1] demands that the result of a  $N^n$ LO calculation (terms up to and including  $r_n a^{n+1}$ ) in two *different* schemes should differ by  $O(a^{n+2})$ . This implies the following dependences of the  $r_i$  on the scheme parameters-  $r_2(r_1, c_2)$ ,  $r_3(r_1, c_2, c_3), \dots, r_n(r_1, c_2, c_3, \dots, c_n)$ . The explicit dependences imposed by self-consistency are found to be

$$\begin{aligned} r_2(r_1, c_2) &= r_1^2 + cr_1 + X_2 - c_2 \\ r_3(r_1, c_2, c_3) &= r_1^3 + \frac{5}{2}cr_1^2 + (3X_2 - 2c_2)r_1 + X_3 - \frac{1}{2}c_3 \\ &\vdots \quad \quad \quad \vdots \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

In general the structure is

$$r_n(r_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) = \hat{r}_n(r_1, c_2, \dots, c_{n-1}) + X_n - c_n/(n-1) . \tag{9}$$

Here  $\hat{r}_n$  is an  $n^{\text{th}}$  order polynomial in  $r_1$  which is determined given a complete  $N^{n-1}$ LO calculation.  $X_n$  is  $Q$ -independent and RS-invariant and can only be determined given a complete  $N^n$ LO calculation.  $\hat{r}_n$  is the “RG-predictable” part of  $r_n$ , and  $X_n$  is “RG-unpredictable”. Thus, given a NNLO calculation in the  $\overline{MS}$  scheme with  $\mu = Q$  one can determine the RS-invariant

$$X_2 = r_2^{\overline{MS}}(\mu = Q) - (r_1^{\overline{MS}}(\mu = Q))^2 - c r_1^{\overline{MS}}(\mu = Q) + c_2^{\overline{MS}} , \tag{10}$$

where

$$c_2^{\overline{MS}} = \frac{77139 - 15099N_f + 325N_f^2}{1728b} . \tag{11}$$

By a complete  $N^n$ LO calculation we mean that  $c_2, c_3, \dots, c_n$  have been computed as well as  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ . We note in passing that  $c_3^{\overline{MS}}$  has now been calculated [8].

Using Eqs.(8) we can now exhibit the explicit RS-dependence of the terms of Eq.(1),

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) = a + r_1 a^2 + (r_1^2 + cr_1 + X_2 - c_2) a^3 + (r_1^3 + \frac{5}{2}cr_1^2 + (3X_2 - 2c_2)r_1 + X_3 - \frac{1}{2}c_3) a^4 + \dots , \tag{12}$$

where  $a \equiv a(r_1, c_2, c_3, \dots)$ . We now implement the idea of “complete” RG-improvement (CORGI). At any given order of Feynman diagram calculation *all* known (RG-predictable) terms should be resummed to all-orders. Given a NLO calculation  $r_1$  is known but  $X_2, X_3, \dots$  are unknown. Thus the complete subset of known terms in Eq.(12) at NLO is

$$a_0 \equiv a + r_1 a^2 + (r_1^2 + cr_1 - c_2)a^3 + (r_1^3 + \frac{5}{2}cr_1^2 - 2c_2r_1 - \frac{1}{2}c_3)a^4 + \dots \quad (13)$$

The sum of these terms,  $a_0$ , can be simply determined using the following two-step argument. The infinite subset of terms in Eq.(13) has an RS-independent sum, since the  $X_2, X_3, \dots$ , -dependent terms cannot cancel their RS-dependence, and we know that the full sum of Eq.(12) is RS-invariant. Each term is a multinomial in  $r_1, c_2, c_3, \dots$ . Using the RS-independence we can set  $r_1 = 0, c_2 = 0, c_3 = 0, \dots$ , in which case all terms but the first in Eq.(13) vanish and we obtain  $a_0 = a(r_1 = 0, c_2 = 0, c_3 = 0, \dots, c_n = 0, \dots)$ . So at NLO CORGI corresponds to working in an “t Hooft scheme” with  $c_2 = c_3 = \dots = 0$  [9], and with  $r_1 = 0$ . From Eq.(6)  $r_1 = 0$  corresponds to  $\tau = b \ln(Q/\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}})$  or to an  $\overline{MS}$  scale  $\mu = e^{-r/b}Q$ . This is the so-called “fastest apparent convergence” (FAC) or effective charge (EC) scale [1, 2]. From Eq.(5) we find that  $a_0$  satisfies

$$\frac{1}{a_0} + c \ln \left( \frac{ca_0}{1 + ca_0} \right) = b \ln \left( \frac{Q}{\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}} \right). \quad (14)$$

We note to avoid confusion that the definition of  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  on which Eq.(5) is based [1] differs from that usually used for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$ . In terms of the standard definition we have,

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}} = e^{r/b} \left( \frac{2c}{b} \right)^{-c/b} \Lambda_{\overline{MS}}. \quad (15)$$

If a NNLO calculation has been completed, then  $X_2$  can be determined (as in Eq.(10)), and a further infinite subset of terms are known and can be resummed to all-orders,

$$X_2 a_0^3 = X_2 a^3 + 3X_2 r_1 a^4 + \dots \quad (16)$$

The RS-independence of the sum and the multinomial structure of the coefficients again leads to a resummed result involving  $a_0$ . CORGI at each order finally leads to

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) = a_0 + X_2 a_0^3 + X_3 a_0^4 + \dots + X_n a_0^{n+1} + \dots, \quad (17)$$

which is simply the perturbation series in the RS with  $r_1 = c_2 = c_3 = \dots = c_n = \dots = 0$ .

One can make a very strong case for the principle of complete RG-improvement. Clearly we cannot resum to all-orders *more* terms than are exactly known, and the only reason to leave out some known terms would be if their omission compensated the effect of higher-order corrections  $X_n$ , but these contributions are simply unknown. The  $X_n$  can be used to parametrize uncalculated higher-order corrections. A further crucial feature of CORGI is that it serves to generate the correct  $Q$ -dependence of the observable via the resummation of all ultraviolet logarithms. To see this it will be useful to first briefly review the effective charge approach of Grunberg [2] which is based on specifying the  $Q$ -dependence of  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ .

In the effective charge (EC) approach one considers the  $Q$ -evolution of  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$  in terms of  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$  itself,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{R}(Q)}{\partial \ln Q} = -b\mathcal{R}^2(1 + c\mathcal{R} + \rho_2\mathcal{R}^2 + \rho_3\mathcal{R}^3 + \dots) \equiv -b\rho(\mathcal{R}) . \quad (18)$$

This equation may be regarded as the beta-function equation (Eq.(2)) in the RS where  $r_1 = r_2 = \dots = r_n = \dots = 0$ , so that  $\mathcal{R} = a$ . This effective charge scheme corresponds to  $r_1 = 0, c_2 = \rho_2, \dots, c_n = \rho_n, \dots$ . The  $\rho_n$  are RS-invariant and  $Q$ -independent combinations of the perturbation series and beta-function coefficients with, for instance,

$$\rho_2 = r_2 + c_2 - r_1 c - r_1^2 . \quad (19)$$

These invariants are closely connected with the  $X_n$  invariants which arise in the CORGI approach. One finds that

$$X_2 = \rho_2, \quad X_3 = \rho_3/2, \quad X_4 = \rho_4/3 + 2\rho_2^2 + c\rho_3/6, \quad \dots \quad (20)$$

Integrating up Eq.(18) and applying asymptotic freedom ( $\mathcal{R}(Q) \rightarrow 0$  as  $Q \rightarrow \infty$ ) as a boundary condition one obtains [2, 4]

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{R}} + c \ln \left( \frac{c\mathcal{R}}{1 + c\mathcal{R}} \right) = b \ln \left( \frac{Q}{\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}} \right) - \int_0^{\mathcal{R}} dx \left( -\frac{1}{\rho(x)} + \frac{1}{x^2(1 + cx)} \right) . \quad (21)$$

Alternatively Eq.(21) can be regarded as Eq.(5) in the EC scheme where  $\tau = \rho_0 = b \ln(Q/\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}})$ , and  $a = \mathcal{R}$ . From Eq.(21) we see that the leading large- $Q$  behaviour of  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$  is

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) \approx G\left(b \ln \frac{Q}{\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}}\right) = a_0, \quad (22)$$

where  $G(x)$  is the inverse function to  $1/x + c \ln(cx/(1+cx))$ . For  $c = 0$  this reduces to  $\mathcal{R}(Q) \approx 1/b \ln(Q/\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}})$ . So, as advertised,  $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}$  has a physical significance in setting the large- $Q$  evolution of the observable  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$ .

The crucial point which we now wish to demonstrate is that in the CORGI approach the above  $Q$ -dependence emerges only if the  $r_1$  terms are resummed to all-orders. We first note that from Eq.(6) we may write

$$r_1(\mu) = \left(b \ln \frac{\mu}{\bar{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}}} - b \ln \frac{Q}{\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}}\right), \quad (23)$$

with  $\mu$  taken to be the  $\overline{MS}$  scale as is customary. The  $\mu$ -dependent logarithm is completely irrelevant since, as we shall demonstrate, all dependence on  $\tau \equiv b \ln(\mu/\bar{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}})$  disappears on resumming the  $r_1$  terms to all-orders. The correct  $Q$ -dependence of  $\mathcal{R}(Q)$  is generated by all-orders resummation of the ultraviolet (UV) logarithms  $\ln(Q/\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}})$ . Normally one would choose  $\mu = xQ$  with  $x = 1$  the allegedly “physical” scale favoured in analyses, we stress however that the correct  $Q$ -dependence still results even if  $\mu$  is taken to be a dimensionful constant independent of  $Q$ .  $\mu$  is truly an irrelevant parameter, it is the resummation of all UV logarithms that is crucial.

To see the  $Q$ -dependence emerge it is convenient to simplify the algebra by setting  $c = 0$  and  $c_2 = c_3 = \dots = 0$ . Then

$$a(\mu) = 1/b \ln(\mu/\bar{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}}), \quad (24)$$

and the NLO RG-improvement in Eq.(13) becomes a geometrical progression in  $r_1$ ,

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) \approx a(\mu) + r_1(\mu)a^2(\mu) + r_1^2(\mu)a^3(\mu) + \dots. \quad (25)$$

Substituting Eq.(23) for  $r_1(\mu)$ , summing the geometrical progression and using Eq.(24) for  $a(\mu)$  yields

$$\mathcal{R}(Q) \approx a(\mu) / \left[1 - \left(b \ln \frac{\mu}{\bar{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}}} - b \ln \frac{Q}{\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}}\right) a(\mu)\right] = 1/b \ln(Q/\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}). \quad (26)$$

Since the  $X_n$  are  $Q$ -independent these UV logarithms are the only terms involved in generating the  $Q$ -dependence of the observable, and they must be completely resummed to all-orders. This resummation may be accomplished by using the FAC (EC) scale  $\mu = e^{-r/b}Q$ . The standard practice of using the “physical” scale  $\mu = Q$  effectively truncates the summation of the geometrical progression and if the NLO coefficient  $r$  is large can introduce considerable inaccuracy into the extraction of  $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}}$ .

Eqs.(20) for the  $X_n$  and  $\rho_n$  invariants make it clear that the EC and CORGI approaches are closely related. In NLO they are identical and in higher-orders correspond to different RS-invariant ways of parametrizing the uncalculated higher-order corrections. Crucially in both approaches all  $Q$ -dependent UV logarithms are resummed to all-orders, thus reproducing correctly the  $Q$ -dependence of the observable. These two approaches therefore represent equally reasonable RG-improvements of QCD perturbation theory, and the results for  $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\overline{MS}}$  or  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  obtained using them should be comparable unless the first uncalculated  $X_n$  or  $\rho_n$  invariant is large, in which case fixed-order perturbation theory will be unreliable. We note that the “principle of minimal sensitivity” (PMS) approach [1] also results in an RG-improvement sharing these desirable features.

We should finally comment on the operational significance of these ideas for the extraction of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$  (or  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ ) from experimental data. In the standard approach (as reviewed in Ref.[5]) one determines  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$  by fitting the NLO  $\overline{MS}$  scheme prediction with scale  $\mu = xQ$  to the data. Typically  $x = 1$  is taken to provide a central value and variation between (say)  $x = 0.5$  and  $x = 2$  provides an upper and lower theoretical error estimate. This theoretical error is supposed to be an estimate of the effect of “uncalculated higher order corrections”. Our point is that an infinite subset of these uncalculated corrections are RG-predictable, and can and should be resummed to all-orders, this resummation being required to build the correct  $Q$ -dependence of the observable. The truly RG-unpredictable and unknown higher-order corrections are then parametrized by the first uncalculated  $X_n$  or  $\rho_n$  RS-invariant. Using the effective charge scale  $\mu = e^{-r/b}Q$  the scatter in the  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$  values obtained for different observables at NLO then reflects the relative differences in the size of  $X_2$  or  $\rho_2$  [4]. In particular the hypothesis that these RG-unpredictable NNLO effects are small is tested directly if the values of



$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}$  obtained for a range of observables are similar. This exercise has been performed (for EC and PMS) in Ref.[10], although we disagree with the final conclusions reached in that work.

The experimental isolation of power correction effects for observables is also complicated by scale dependence and should also be carried out in this framework, as has recently been discussed in Ref.[6]. The approach can also be straightforwardly modified to eliminate the matching ambiguity in the resummation of large kinematical logarithms for jet observables [4].

Whilst the EC, CORGI and PMS approaches all represent equally well-motivated RG-improvements, CORGI should enable somewhat more straightforward fitting to data, and should also considerably simplify the renormalon-inspired RS-invariant “leading- $b$ ” all-orders resummations of perturbation theory suggested in Ref.[11]. We hope to report on these and other applications in future work.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank John Campbell and Nigel Glover for a productive collaboration and numerous discussions which were instrumental in developing the ideas reported here.

## References

- [1] P.M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. **D23** (1981) 2916.
- [2] G. Grunberg, Phys. Lett. **B95** (1980) 70; Phys. Rev. **D29** (1984) 2315.
- [3] S.J. Brodsky ,G.P.Lepage and P.B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 228.
- [4] D.T. Barclay, C.J. Maxwell and M.T. Reader, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 3480.
- [5] S. Bethke, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 64 (1998) 54.
- [6] J.M. Campbell, E.W.N. Glover and C.J. Maxwell, Durham preprint DTP/98/08, hep-ph/9803254.
- [7] H.D. Politzer and P.M. Stevenson, Nucl. Phys. **B277** (1986) 758.
- [8] S.A. Larin, T. Van Ritbergen and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. **B400** (1997) 379.
- [9] G.'t Hooft in : “The Whys of Subnuclear Physics”, Erice (1977), ed. A. Zichichi (Plenum, New York, 1977).
- [10] P.N. Burrows, H. Masuda and D. Muller, Phys. Lett. **B382** (1996) 157.
- [11] C.J. Maxwell and D.G. Tonge, Nucl. Phys. **B481** (1996) 681.